

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/007,763	11/08/2001	Junsong Li	SC11804TS	3072
23125 7	590 04/05/2004		EXAM	INER
MOTOROLA INC AUSTIN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW SECTION 7700 WEST PARMER LANE MD: TX32/PL02 AUSTIN, TX 78729			JACOBSON, TONY M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2644	10
AUSTIN, IX	10127		DATE MAILED: 04/05/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	10/007,763	LI ET AL.				
	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Tony M Jacobson	2644				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
THE REPLY FILED 05 March 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.						
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]						
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:						
(a) Methey raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);				
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.						
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):						
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).						
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:						
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.						
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed: none.						
Claim(s) objected to: none.						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-6 and 8-24</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.						
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)						
10. Other:						
MINEUN OH HARVEY PRIMARY I IN INCH						





Continuation of 2. NOTE: The proposed amendments to claims 1, 8-10, 18, and 21, to add the limitations of first and second low-pass filters, separately controlled, with the second low-pass filter (filtering the signal that contains a difference of left and right channel information) having its bandwidth varied before the bandwidth of the first low-pass filter (filtering the signal that contains a sum of left and right channel information) has its bandwidth varied (or the reverse, in claim 18), raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. The portion of proposed amendment to claim 18, adding "in the intermediate signal" at line 8 of the claim, would be acceptable as placing the claims in better form for appeal and complying with the requirement of the rejection of that claim under 35 USC 112, second paragraph in the previous Office action if a separate paper were filed containing only that amendment. The proposed amendment to claim 8 does not correct the basis for the rejection of that claim under 35 USC 112, second paragraph in the previous Office action as the claim recites further comprising first and second low-pass filters when first and second low-pass filters are already recited in claim 1. If these are intende to be the same low-pass filters recited in claim1, then claim 8 appears to attempt to broaden the scope of claim 1 and is thus an improper dependent claim.